



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/242,561	02/19/1999	YOSHIHIRO SATO	10235/4	1215

23838 7590 12/23/2002

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

FORMAN, BETTY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1634

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2002

27

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/242,561

Applicant(s)

SATO, YOSHIHIRO

Examiner

BJ Forman

Art Unit

1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 34 and 37-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 34 and 37-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 February 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1634

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to papers filed 4 October 2002 in Paper No. 25 in which claims 21, 22, 25, 29, 32 and 33 were canceled. The previous rejections in the Office Action of Paper No. 24 dated 5 June 2002 are withdrawn in view of the amendments.

The paper copy of the Sequence Listing and computer readable form of the sequence listing submitted with Paper No. 25 is acknowledged and has been entered.

2. The following objections and rejections may be overcome by amending the specification and claims as suggested by the examiner. A phone call was made to Ms. Lavenue on 17 December 2002 to request authority to enter Examiner's Amendments. However, Ms. Lavenue was unavailable for authorization.

3. Claims 34 and 37-39 are free of the prior art of record and may be placed in condition for allowance following resolution of the objections and rejections detailed below.

Claims 34 and 37-39 are under prosecution.

Specification

Abstract

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it does not provide a clear description of the disclosure and/or invention.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape

Art Unit: 1634

used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Disclosure

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

a. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested:

A method for conducting PCR protected from evaporation.

b. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 119 as follows:

An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence of the specification or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)).

Applicant is required to amend the specification to contain a reference to the parent international application e.g. "This application is a 371 of PCT/JP98/02389, filed 05/29/98."

Art Unit: 1634

c. The use of the trademarks has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Appropriate correction is required.

d. The amendment filed 16 January 2001 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: The amendments to Claim 34 adds the limitation "planar" substrate. The originally filed specification teaches a "glass plate" (e.g. page 4, line 5); "transparent lower plate" (original claim 13) and the drawings (e.g. Fig 1) illustrate a portion of the substrate wherein that portion is planar, but they drawings do not illustrate a planar substrate. However, the original disclosure does not teach or describe a "planar substrate" as instantly claimed. Therefore the added material constitutes new matter.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

35 U.S.C. 112: First paragraph

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1634

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 34 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The recitation "planar substrate" has been added to the amended independent claim 34 from which claims 37-39 depend. However, the specification fails to define or provide any disclosure to support such claim recitation. Claim 34 recites the limitation "planar" substrate. The originally filed specification teaches a "glass plate" (e.g. page 4, line 5); "transparent lower plate" (original claim 13) and the drawings (e.g. Fig 1) illustrate a portion of the substrate wherein that portion is planar, but they drawings do not illustrate a planar substrate. However, the original disclosure does not teach or describe a "planar substrate" as instantly claimed. Therefore, the amendments introduces subject matter not described in the specification as filed.

It is suggested that Claim 34 be amended to describe the invention as defined in the original specification i.e. replace "planar substrate" with "glass slide", "glass substrate", "glass plate" or "plate".

MPEP 2163.06 notes "IF NEW MATTER IS ADDED TO THE CLAIMS, THE EXAMINER SHOULD REJECT THE CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH - WRITTEN DESCRIPTION REQUIREMENT. *IN RE RASMUSSEN*, 650 F.2D 1212, 211 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981)." MPEP 2163.02 teaches that "Whenever the issue arises, the fundamental factual inquiry is whether a claim defines an invention that is clearly conveyed to those skilled in the art at the time the application was filed...If a claim is amended to include subject matter, limitations, or terminology not present in the application as filed, involving a departure from, addition to, or deletion from the disclosure of the application as filed, the examiner should conclude that the claimed subject matter is not described in that application." MPEP 2163.06 further notes "WHEN AN AMENDMENT IS FILED IN REPLY TO AN OBJECTION OR REJECTION BASED ON 35 U.S.C. 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH, A STUDY OF THE ENTIRE APPLICATION IS OFTEN NECESSARY TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT "NEW MATTER" IS INVOLVED. APPLICANT SHOULD THEREFORE SPECIFICALLY POINT OUT THE SUPPORT FOR ANY AMENDMENTS MADE TO THE DISCLOSURE" (emphasis added).

Art Unit: 1634

35 U.S.C. 112: Second paragraph

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 34 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. Claims 34 and 37-39 are indefinite in Claim 34 for the recitation "inkjet technique" because it is unclear whether the "shooting" utilizes an inkjet. It is suggested that Claim 34 be amended to clarify e.g. delete "technique".

b. Claims 34 and 37-39 are indefinite in Claim 34 because the claim is drawn to a method for conducting PCR protected from evaporation, but the method does not recite PCR or evaporation protection method steps. It is suggested that Claim 34 be amended to recite language which accomplishes the method as claimed e.g. replace "and conducting a reaction is said minute droplet with said reactant whereby evaporation is reduced" with "and conducting a PCR reaction is said minute droplet whereby said PCR reaction is protected from evaporation."

Conclusion

10. Claims 34 and 37-39 are free of the prior art of record and may be placed in condition for allowance following resolution of the above issues.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BJ Forman whose telephone number is (703) 306-5878. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 TO 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jones can be reached on (703) 308-1152. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this

Application/Control Number: 09/242,561

Page 7

Art Unit: 1634

application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4242 for regular communications and (703) 308-8724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



BJ Forman, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 1634
December 18, 2002